

Jeffrey B. Cereghino, SBN #099480
 Email: jbc@rocklawcal.com
 Matt Malone, SBN #221545
 Email: mjm@rocklawcal.com
 ROCK LAW LLP
 101 Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
 San Francisco, California 94104
 Telephone: (415) 433-4949

Charles J. LaDuca, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
 Email: charles@cuneolaw.com
 Brendan Thompson, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
 Email: brendant@cuneolaw.com
 CUNEO GILBERT & LaDUCA, LLP
 4725 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Suite 200
 Washington, DC 20016
 Telephone: (202) 789-3960

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANA GOLD, TAMMY EMERY, MARY
 LOUISE FERENCÉ, LAURA NORRIS,
 DONALD FURSMAN, and JOHN TRIANA,
 on behalf of themselves and all others
 similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LUMBER LIQUIDATORS, INC., a Delaware
 corporation; and DOES 1 through 200, inclusive,

Defendants.

No. 3:14-cv-05373-RS

**FIFTH AMENDED CLASS
 ACTION COMPLAINT**

CLASS ACTION

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

The Honorable Richard Seeborg

Complaint Filed: December 8, 2014

Through the undersigned counsel and pursuant to ECF No. 215 (Order Granting Motion for Class Certification), Plaintiffs DANA GOLD, TAMMY EMERY, MARY LOUISE FERENCÉ, LAURA NORRIS, DONALD FURSMAN, and JOHN TRIANA on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated (“Plaintiffs”), file this fifth amended class action complaint against Defendant Lumber Liquidators, Inc. (“Defendant” or “Lumber Liquidators”).

1 On personal knowledge of their own circumstances and upon investigation and information and
2 belief of their counsel, Plaintiffs aver the following:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Defendant develops, manufactures, advertises, sells, and distributes bamboo
5 flooring under the brand name Morning Star Strand Bamboo Flooring (the “Product”)
6 throughout the United States for installation in homes and other structures.

7 2. Defendant markets and warrants that the Product is durable and meets industry
8 standards, and markets and warrants that the Product has a thirty (30) year warranty.
9 Defendant provided a reasonable expectation to consumers and the industry that the Product
10 would have a usable lifetime of at least thirty (30) years.

11 3. Contrary to Defendant’s advertising and representations, the Product is subject
12 to premature cracking, splitting, warping, and shrinking, all well before the warranted useful
13 life.

14 4. The Product’s various modes of failure potentially cause damage to other
15 building components and render the Product susceptible to premature failure.

16 5. Plaintiffs bring this action to seek redress for damages caused by Defendant’s
17 wrongful conduct.

18 **JURISDICTION**

19 6. This Court has jurisdiction over this case under 28 U.S.C. 1332(d)(2) in that: (1)
20 this action is a class action with more than one hundred (100) Class Members; (2) Defendant
21 Lumber Liquidators, Inc. is a Delaware corporation, based in the state of Virginia, and is thus a
22 citizen of the state of Delaware; (3) Plaintiffs and all Class Members are United States citizens;
23 and (4) the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest
24 and costs.

VENUE

7. Venue in this Court is proper: (1) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1391(a)(1) in that Defendant does sufficient business in this District to subject it to personal jurisdiction herein; and (2) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1391(a)(2) in that a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this District.

INTRADISTRICT VENUE

8. Venue in this Division of the Northern District is proper because a substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to the claim occurred in Contra Costa County.

PARTIES

9. Plaintiff Dana Gold ("Plaintiff Gold") is a California resident and owns a home located at 1192 Bacon Way in Lafayette, California.

10. Plaintiff Tammy Emery ("Plaintiff Emery") is a West Virginia resident and owns a home located at 219 Picket Avenue in Inwood, West Virginia.

11. Plaintiff Mary Louise Ference ("Plaintiff Ference") is an Illinois resident and owns a home located at 1301 South Douglas Street in Springfield, Illinois.

12. Plaintiff Laura Norris ("Plaintiff Norris") is a Minnesota resident and owns a home located at 7327 West 110th Street in Bloomington, Minnesota.

13. Plaintiff Donald Fursman ("Plaintiff Fursman") is a Pennsylvania resident and owns a home located at 626 Trimble Boulevard in Brookhaven, Pennsylvania.

14. Plaintiff John Triana ("Plaintiff Triana") is a Florida resident and owns a home located at 24 Captiva Drive in Ponte Verde Beach, Florida.

15. Defendant Lumber Liquidators, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Toano, Virginia. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant conducts business within the United States, and more specifically within the state of California. Also on information and belief, Plaintiffs allege that Defendant was responsible for, or

1 otherwise involved in, the development, manufacture, marketing, sales, warranting and
2 distribution of the Product.

3 16. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued
4 herein as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, (“Doe Defendants”) and therefore sues these Doe
5 Defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to allege the true names
6 and capacities of these fictitiously-named Doe Defendants when they are ascertained. Each of
7 the fictitiously-named Doe Defendants is responsible for the conduct alleged in this Complaint
8 and Plaintiffs’ damages were actually and proximately caused by the conduct of the fictitiously
9 named Doe Defendants.

10 17. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that each of these
11 Doe Defendants was the agent, joint venture, and/or employee of Defendant and/or the Doe
12 Defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting within the course and
13 scope of the agency, joint venture, and employment with the advance knowledge, acquiescence,
14 or subsequent ratification of Defendant and each and every other Doe Defendant.

15 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

16 **B. Plaintiff Gold’s Factual Allegations**

17 18. Plaintiff Gold is a California resident and owns a home located at 1192 Bacon
18 Way in Lafayette, California.

19 19. Before purchasing the Product, Plaintiff Gold visited her local Lumber
20 Liquidators store in Concord, California. There, she spoke with the sales manager who
21 convinced her to purchase the Product rather than traditional hardwood flooring.

22 20. In making his sales pitch, the sales manager described how the Product was
23 made, discussed the quality of the materials used, and discussed the high quality of
24 manufacture.

1 21. The sales manager informed Plaintiff Gold that the Product was harder and more
2 durable than real wood, and that, if she dropped a can of cat food on the Product, it would not
3 dent, unlike hardwood, and that the Product was virtually scratch and dent resistant.

4 22. The sales manager also informed Plaintiff Gold that the Product was at least
5 two-and-a-half times stronger than Red Oak.

6 23. The sales manager also informed Plaintiff Gold that the Product had a lengthy
7 warranty but she was not given the warranty or informed of its terms before her purchase.
8 Although Plaintiff Gold does not recall the length of the warranty, she does recall it was long
9 and implied to her that the Product would last that length of time.

10 24. In reliance on the information she had been given by Defendant, Plaintiff Gold
11 purchased the Product and, in early October 2013, Plaintiff Gold used the services of a licensed
12 flooring contractor to install the Product in her home. Within weeks of installation, and while
13 her home remained unoccupied, Plaintiff Gold observed initial defects with the Product. She
14 observed the Product was scratching easily and splintering.

15 25. She notified Defendant by phone on October 30, 2013. The customer service
16 representative requested she complete a “General Disclosure Statement” to begin the claims
17 process. Plaintiff Gold completed the General Disclosure Statement, and mailed it to
18 Defendant’s claims department.

19 26. On or about December 2, 2013, Richard King of Inspect Solutions, a company
20 retained by Defendant, inspected the Product installed at Plaintiff Gold’s home. He drafted a
21 report on or about December 6, 2013, in which he concluded that Plaintiff Gold and the
22 installers were completely at fault and no Product defects existed.

23 27. The Product continues to manifest defects to the present day, including warping,
24 splitting, buckling, and shrinking.

1 28. On September 3, 2014, Plaintiff Gold placed Defendant on notice of these
2 defects via a Consumers Legal Remedies Act notice (Cal. Civil Code §1782), attached as
3 Exhibit A hereto.

4 **C. Plaintiff Emery's Factual Allegations**

5 29. Plaintiff Emery is a West Virginia resident and owns a home located at
6 219 Picket Avenue in Inwood, West Virginia.

7 30. Before purchasing the Product, Plaintiff Emery was prompted by a local
8 television advertisement about the cost of bamboo flooring to visit her local Martinsburg
9 Lumber Liquidators store. At the store, she viewed samples of the Product and spoke with the
10 manager, William S. Dyess, about the Product.

11 31. Mr. Dyess informed Plaintiff Emery that the Product was “made from the
12 hardest wood.”

13 32. Mr. Dyess provided Plaintiff Emery with a demonstration of the hardness of the
14 Product by hitting a sample of the Product with another piece of wood to demonstrate its
15 durability.

16 33. Plaintiff Emery also reviewed a brochure about the Product and was given a six-
17 inch sample to take home with her.

18 34. Plaintiff Emery was also told the Product had a 30 year warranty but did not
19 review the warranty terms before purchase. She understood that the 30-year warranty implied
20 that the Product would last for that period of time.

21 35. On July 10, 2014, in reliance on the demonstration, samples, and information
22 she had been provided by Defendant, Plaintiff Emery purchased 517 square feet of the Product
23 from Lumber Liquidators.

24 36. On August 4, 2014, the Product was installed in her living and dining rooms and
25 two hallways.

1 37. The installation was conducted by Falling Water Floor, who was referred to
2 Plaintiff Emery by Defendant.

3 38. The cost of the installation was \$4,794.59.

4 39. Within only a few weeks after installation, Plaintiff Emery noticed that the
5 Product was delaminating, warping, splitting, shrinking, and scratching, and generally
6 deteriorating in various places.

7 40. On four occasions, Falling Water Floor Installation had to make repairs to
8 Plaintiff Emery's floor.

9 41. On December 15, 2014, Plaintiff Emery contacted Defendant to put them on
10 notice that her floor was failing and that Falling Water Floor's repair efforts were futile.
11 Instead of immediately taking reasonable steps to replace Plaintiff Emery's flooring, in a letter
12 presumably incorrectly dated "January 5, 2015," Defendant's Customer Care Team stated that
13 they "assigned her claim to James L."

14 42. The Product continues to manifest defects to the present day.

15 43. Plaintiff Emery put Defendant on notice of her claim under the West Virginia
16 Consumer Credit and Protection Act, W. Va. Code §§ 46A-6 *et seq.*, in a letter dated February
17 10, 2015, attached as Exhibit B, hereto.

18 **D. Plaintiff Ference's Factual Allegations**

19 44. Plaintiff Ference is an Illinois resident and owns a home located at 1301 South
20 Douglas Street in Springfield, Illinois.

21 45. Prompted by a television advertisement for the Product, Plaintiff Ference,
22 accompanied by her contractor, Jeff Chunes of JC Construction, visited the Springfield, Illinois
23 Lumber Liquidators store in or around August 2014.

24 46. At the store, Plaintiff Ference and her contractor spoke with a sales associate,
25 who represented that the Product was very durable, would stand up to heavy wear, and was
26 much harder than hardwood flooring.

1 47. The sales associate also indicated that Lumber Liquidators stands behind its
2 products and that the Product came with a warranty. The associate did not, however, review
3 the warranty's terms with Plaintiff Ference or provide a copy for her to review prior to
4 purchasing the Product.

5 48. As purported demonstrations of the Product's durability, the sales associate tried
6 to scratch or gouge a sample of the Product with a metal object and tried to dent a sample by
7 hitting it with another piece of wood. The Product appeared to withstand these tests.

8 49. In reliance upon Defendant's representations, Plaintiff Ference purchased the
9 Product—to wit, Morning Star "Xiamen" strand bamboo flooring—at a cost of approximately
10 \$4,900.

11 50. In the following months, JC Construction installed the Product in Plaintiff
12 Ference's home.

13 51. Within a few months of installation, Plaintiff Ference observed that the Product
14 was warping, shrinking, gapping, and buckling.

15 52. Attempting to remedy these problems, JC Construction returned to Plaintiff
16 Ference's home on at least three occasions and reinstalled much of the flooring, but these
17 efforts had minimal, if any, effect.

18 53. In early 2015, Mr. Chunes contacted the manager of the Springfield, Illinois
19 Lumber Liquidators store regarding the problems with Plaintiff Ference's floor. The manager
20 refused to assist and referred Mr. Chunes to Defendant's customer service department, to
21 whom he then submitted a warranty claim on Plaintiff Ference's behalf.

22 54. Defendant responded by denying Plaintiff Ference's claim, suggesting, in a
23 letter dated April 17, 2015, that the problems with her flooring were attributable to humidity.

24 55. The Product continues to manifest defects to the present day.
25
26
27

E. Plaintiff Norris' Factual Allegations

56. Plaintiff Norris is a Minnesota resident and owns a home located at 7327 West 110th Street in Bloomington, Minnesota.

57. Before purchasing the Product, Plaintiff Norris was prompted by a local television advertisement regarding the flooring products sold at Lumber Liquidators to contact Defendant.

58. Plaintiff Norris contacted Defendant by telephone to learn about the different flooring options. During the call, Plaintiff Norris inquired about hardwood, laminate, and bamboo flooring. The customer service representative advised Plaintiff Norris to purchase the Product, stating that it was the most durable option.

59. Soon after speaking with the Defendant's customer service representative, Plaintiff Norris visited her local Lumber Liquidators store in Burnsville, Minnesota. There, she spoke with a sales associate who explained to her that the Product is much stronger than traditional hardwood flooring.

60. In order to demonstrate the durability of the Product, the sales associate showed Plaintiff Norris a large, approximately 6' x 8' sample of the Product, which was located next to the main entrance of the store.

61. As part of his sales pitch, the sales associate explained that Lumber Liquidators stands behind its products and that the Product is supported by a warranty. The sales associate, however, did not review the terms of the warranty with Plaintiff Norris or provide a copy for Plaintiff Norris to review prior to purchasing the Product.

62. In August 2014, and in reliance on the information she had been given by Defendant over the telephone and in the store, Plaintiff Norris purchased the Product.

63. Plaintiff Norris used the services of a licensed contractor to install the Product in her home in September 2014.

64. Within two months of installation, Plaintiff Norris observed that the Product was cupping, shrinking, warping, and splitting.

1 65. In or around November 2014, Plaintiff Norris contacted Defendant via telephone
2 regarding the problems she was experiencing with the Product. The customer service
3 representative requested that Plaintiff Norris complete a “General Disclosure Statement” to
4 begin the claims process. Plaintiff Norris completed the General Disclosure Statement, and
5 mailed it to Defendant’s claims department.

6 **F. Plaintiff Fursman’s Factual Allegations**

7 66. Plaintiff Fursman is Pennsylvania resident and owns a home located at
8 626 Trimble Boulevard in Brookhaven, Pennsylvania.

9 67. Before purchasing the Product, Plaintiff Fursman visited his local Lumber
10 Liquidators store in Claymont, Delaware on two occasions. Plaintiff Fursman’s first visit was
11 in July 2014 and his second visit was in August 2014.

12 68. During his first visit, Plaintiff Fursman spoke with a Lumber Liquidators sales
13 representative who emphasized the high quality and durability of the Product as well as the
14 superior performance of the Product as compared to other hardwood flooring products.

15 69. The sales representative informed Plaintiff Fursman that the Product was
16 “harder and more durable than real wood,” “remarkably tougher, harder, stronger than normal
17 hardwoods,” “more water resistant than normal hardwood floors,” “superior and better quality
18 than other hardwoods,” and “came with a thirty year warranty.”

19 70. In touting the hardness and durability of the Product, the sales representative
20 provided Plaintiff Fursman with a demonstration by hitting a sample of the Product with an
21 object, which did not dent the flooring sample.

22 71. Plaintiff Fursman also reviewed product brochures for the Product as well as
23 other hardwood flooring products, which he took home.

24 72. In addition, Plaintiff Fursman was given an eight to ten inch sample of the
25 Product to take home.
26
27

1 73. Plaintiff Fursman returned to his local Lumber Liquidators store in Claymont,
2 Delaware for his second visit in August 2014.

3 74. During this second visit, Plaintiff Fursman spoke with a Lumber Liquidators
4 sales representative who again emphasized the high quality and durability of the Product as
5 well as the superior performance of the Product as compared to other hardwood flooring
6 products.

7 75. The sales representative reiterated the same sales pitch as the first sales
8 representative and informed Plaintiff Fursman that the Product was harder and more durable
9 than real wood, remarkably tougher, harder, stronger than normal hardwoods, more water
10 resistant than normal hardwood floors, was superior and better quality than other hardwoods,
11 and came with a thirty year warranty.

12 76. Plaintiff Fursman was given an additional eight to ten inch sample of the
13 Product to take home.

14 77. After completing his second visits to a Lumber Liquidators store, Plaintiff
15 Fursman reviewed the product brochures he took home as well as the information on
16 Defendant's website regarding the Product. The information reviewed and relied upon by
17 Plaintiff Fursman included, but was not limited to, the following statements:

- 18 a. "They're finely crafted to ensure they're free of defects."
19 b. "Each Morning Star floor is manufactured to be exceptionally durable so
20 it withstands the rigors of everyday life."
21 c. "Morning Star Bamboo is two to two-and-a-half times harder than red
22 oak, so it holds up well to "pretty much anything you can put it through."
23 d. "To make strand bamboo, shredded bamboo fibers are compressed under
24 extreme heat and pressure. This manufacturing process yields flooring that is even harder and
25 denser than traditional bamboo floors."
26
27

1 e. “Morning Star Bamboo Flooring is one of the best bamboo floors on the
2 market today. It is produced from old growth bamboo reeds that are at least 4 years old,
3 thereby increasing hardness. Morning Star Bamboo Flooring creates a naturally beautiful and
4 ecologically friendly product that evokes a feeling of luxury.”

5 78. After his visits to his local Lumber Liquidators stores, Plaintiff Fursman also
6 reviewed the Product’s limited warranty and installation instructions.

7 79. Plaintiff Fursman also reviewed and relied on Defendant’s representations that
8 its Product meets accepted industry standards, including ASTM International.

9 80. Based on the samples, demonstration, and information provided by Defendant in
10 its brochures, on its website, and by its sales representatives, including the Product’s limited
11 warranty, installation instructions, and marketing and advertising materials, Plaintiff Fursman,
12 purchased 597.30 square feet of the Product from Defendant on or around September 30, 2014.
13 He paid \$2,802.54 for the Product.

14 81. Prior to installation, and in accordance with the installation instructions, the
15 Product was acclimated in the room in which the Product was to be installed from date of
16 purchase, September 30, 2014, until the last week of October 2014.

17 82. After the product was properly acclimated in accordance with the installation
18 instructions, Plaintiff Fursman installed the Product in his home’s living room, dining room,
19 and kitchen during the period of October 23-29, 2104.

20 83. After installation, Plaintiff Fursman observed that the Product was excessively
21 shrinking throughout his home. The shrinkage was so severe that it created large gaps between
22 the Product slats and the baseboards. In some areas, the shrinkage produced three-inch gaps
23 between the Product and the baseboards.

24 84. On or around March 12, 2014, as a result of the excessive shrinkage of the
25 Product, Plaintiff Fursman contacted his local Lumber Liquidators store, where he purchased
26
27

1 the Product, regarding the defective nature of the Product. He was instructed by his local
2 Lumber Liquidators store to call (800) HARDWOOD and report his claim.

3 85. On or around March 12, 2014, Plaintiff Fursman called (800) HARDWOOD
4 and spoke to a Lumber Liquidators claims representative about the premature failure of the
5 Product.

6 86. On April 13, 2015, Plaintiff Fursman received a letter from Defendant's
7 Customer Care Team indicating that his claim had been assigned to a customer care
8 representative.

9 87. Shortly thereafter, Plaintiff Fursman properly and completely filled out
10 Defendant's warranty claim form and submitted it to Defendant along with all of the requested
11 information and photographs of the Product.

12 88. On May 11, 2015, Plaintiff Fursman received a letter from Defendant denying
13 his warranty claim and indicating that the gapping issue he was experiencing was the result of
14 either inadequate installation or environmental factors in his home. The letter further stated
15 that because the gapping is typically not a manufacturing issue, Defendant does not order an
16 inspection of the flooring.

17 **G. Plaintiff Triana's Factual Allegations**

18 89. Plaintiff Triana is a Florida resident and owns a home located at 24 Captiva
19 Drive in Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida.

20 90. Before purchasing the Product, Plaintiff Triana considered several retailers, who
21 sent representatives to his home to take measurements and discuss various flooring options.

22 91. With a dog living in the home and his grandchildren visiting frequently,
23 Plaintiff Triana's most important criteria for the new floor included stability and
24 hardness/durability.

1 92. In researching various flooring materials and brands online, Plaintiff Triana
2 looked into the Product on Defendant's website, where he recalls reading claims touting the
3 Product's hardness relative to other flooring materials and other bamboo flooring products.

4 93. In addition, Defendant's representatives with whom Plaintiff Triana spoke at his
5 home and later at the Jacksonville, Florida store recommended the Product as the best option
6 for his needs.

7 94. These individuals represented that the Product was very stable and very hard—
8 two-and-a-half times harder than hardwood flooring.

9 95. Furthermore, they represented that the Product was "carbonized" and heat-
10 treated, under extreme pressure, to remove natural oils in the material making it much harder
11 than traditional bamboo flooring.

12 96. A salesperson in the Jacksonville store provided a demonstration in support of
13 these representations, hitting the Product with a hammer to show it would not dent.

14 97. Plaintiff Triana also recalls representations by Defendant that the Product was
15 protected by a 30 year warranty, though he did not receive a copy of the warranty, nor was he
16 made aware of its specific terms, before his purchase of the Product. However the length of the
17 warranty implied that the Product would last.

18 98. In reliance on Defendant's representations, Plaintiff Triana purchased
19 approximately 820 square feet of the Product from the Jacksonville Lumber Liquidators store
20 in April and May 2012, at a total cost of \$4,726.38.

21 99. Defendant provided Plaintiff Triana a list of three approved contractors who
22 could install the flooring, and, based on the specific recommendation of the salesperson who
23 sold him the flooring, Plaintiff Triana selected Coastline Customs Floors, who installed the
24 flooring in his home at a total (labor) cost of \$3,075.41.

1 100. Not long after the Product was installed, Plaintiff Triana began noticing that the
2 Product was cracking, splitting, peeling, and cupping, making the floor increasingly
3 unattractive and unsafe.

4 101. In or around January 2014, Plaintiff Triana notified Defendant of these
5 problems. The in-store representative with whom he spoke provided no assistance. He also
6 called Defendant's main customer service group, which responded by assigning his claim to
7 "Natasha D." and asking him to complete a "General Disclosure Statement." Plaintiff Triana
8 filled out and returned this form on or around March 3, 2014.

9 102. Rather than assessing Plaintiff Triana's claim based on that information or its
10 further investigation, Defendant responded that Plaintiff Triana would need to hire an inspector
11 to come to his home, assess the problems, and provide the results to Defendant (all at Plaintiff
12 Triana's own expense).

13 103. The Product continues to manifest the aforementioned defects to the present
14 day.

15 **H. Product Manufacturing Process and Representations**

16 104. The Product is made by slicing bamboo into strips, cutting the strips into desired
17 widths, immersing the strips in an acid solution to eliminate sugars and starch, (in some cases)
18 staining the material, binding it together into planks using an adhesive, and finally applying a
19 curing lacquer. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant has been manufacturing and
20 selling the Product since approximately 2008. Defendant has sold the Product to thousands of
21 consumers throughout the United States, including California. The Product was and is
22 marketed and sold for use in homes and other structures.

23 105. Defendant concealed from and/or failed to disclose to Plaintiffs and Class
24 Members the defective nature of the Product.

25 a. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant used a variety of
26 methods to communicate representations about the durability and quality of the Product and
27

1 about its warranty to the general public and contractors in the flooring installation business.

2 These representations were published on Internet sites such as YouTube, on Defendant's
3 website, at trade, building, and home shows typically open to the general public and contractors
4 who service ultimate consumers of the Product, and at Defendant's product retail stores.

5 Defendant communicated a common and repeated theme regarding the Product:

6 (i) "Morning Star Bamboo is two to two-and-a-half times harder
7 than red oak, so it holds up well to "pretty much anything you
8 can put it through."

9 (ii) "To make strand bamboo, shredded bamboo fibers are
10 compressed under extreme heat and pressure. This
11 manufacturing process yields flooring that is even harder and
12 more dense than traditional bamboo floors."

13 (iii) "Morning Star Bamboo Flooring ... is produced from old growth
14 bamboo reeds that are at least 4 years old, thereby increasing
15 hardness. Morning Star Bamboo Flooring creates a naturally
16 beautiful and ecologically friendly product that evokes a feeling
17 of luxury."

18 106. Defendant states that its flooring meets accepted industry standards, stating on
19 its website: "QUALITY GUARANTEE: This Flooring is constructed and tested to meet or
20 exceed industry standards for emissions" -- including ASTM 4066 (wear resistance), ASTM
21 3359 (Finish Adhesion) and ASTM 4442 (Moisture Content). *See*
22 [http://www.lumberliquidators.com/assets/images/product_page/Morning_Star_10023638_HS_](http://www.lumberliquidators.com/assets/images/product_page/Morning_Star_10023638_HS_Str_Antique.pdf)
23 [Str_Antique.pdf](http://www.lumberliquidators.com/assets/images/product_page/Morning_Star_10023638_HS_Str_Antique.pdf) (citing various "Technical Specifications").

24 107. The hardness of the Product is a misleading indicator of whether it can
25 withstand scratching and denting better than other hardwood flooring products.
26
27

1 108. Defendant knew that it did not manufacture the Product in such a way as to
2 withstand scratching and denting better than other hardwood flooring products, such as red oak.

3 109. By focusing on the hardness of the Product rather than the other factors that
4 cause the defects experienced by Plaintiffs and Class Members, Defendant intended to mislead
5 consumers into believing its representations that the Product “does not scratch easily” and is
6 “virtually scratch and dent resistant.” These statements were and are false and misleading
7 because Defendant deliberately failed to disclose that factors other than hardness will result in
8 the Product being easily scratched and dented.

9 110. Defendants also failed to disclose that its manufacturing process did not create a
10 product that could prevent scratches and dents better than other hardwood flooring products.

11 111. Defendant represents that the Product meets ASTM 4442, the standard for
12 moisture content. But ASTM 4442 actually prescribes the process for drying wood and wood
13 particle material but does not prescribe the acceptable moisture content of the final, dried
14 product.

15 112. Indeed, bamboo, like wood flooring products, is hygroscopic, meaning it gains
16 and loses moisture as the air around it gains and loses moisture.

17 113. The typical moisture content in wood flooring products is 6% to 9%. *See*
18 [http://www.hardwoodfloorsmag.com/installation/understand-wood-floor-moisture-content-](http://www.hardwoodfloorsmag.com/installation/understand-wood-floor-moisture-content-dimensional-change.html)
19 [dimensional-change.html](http://www.hardwoodfloorsmag.com/installation/understand-wood-floor-moisture-content-dimensional-change.html) (last visited December 16, 2015);
20 <http://www.greenbuildingsupply.com/Not-All-Bamboo-is-Created-Equal> (last visited
21 December 16, 2015).

22 114. By claiming that the Product meets moisture content standard ASTM 4442,
23 Defendant is deliberately misleading consumers to believe that ASTM 4442 means that the
24 Product’s moisture content is within an acceptable range.

25 115. Defendant’s installation instructions provide that the Product may contain up to
26 12% moisture at installation – 3% more than the expected standard. *See*
27

1 http://www.lumberliquidators.com/assets/images/installation/morning_star_clic.pdf (last visited
2 December 16, 2015).

3 116. Defendant fails to disclose to consumers that the Product may contain an
4 elevated moisture content such that even after acclimatization it will fail of its essential purpose
5 and crack, cup, warp, gap, shrink, and otherwise degrade in a defective manner.

6 117. Defendant continues to advertise and sell the Product for use in homes and other
7 structures, omitting to disclose to Plaintiffs and Class Members, their agents, or contractors
8 material facts concerning the Product, including, but not limited to, concealing that the Product
9 was defectively formulated, was and is susceptible to warping, splitting, shrinking, and
10 splintering, does not otherwise perform as represented, and fails far in advance of its purported
11 thirty year warranted life. All of these facts are material to a reasonable consumer. The
12 Product did not perform in accordance with the reasonable expectations of Plaintiffs and Class
13 Members in that it was not durable and suitable for use as a flooring system in their homes and
14 other structures.

15 118. The Product is a manufactured wood product that is defectively designed, tested,
16 and manufactured, and will warp, buckle, splinter, and unreasonably scratch and dent when
17 used in its intended manner. These failures are common in the Product regardless of when,
18 where, or how it is installed.

19 119. As a result of Defendant's misconduct, Plaintiffs and Class Member have
20 suffered actual damages in that the flooring in their homes and other structures has prematurely
21 failed and will continue to do so, potentially damaging other building elements, causing
22 continuous and progressive damage to property, and requiring Plaintiffs and Class Members to
23 expend thousands of dollars to repair or replace the flooring long before the expiration of the
24 "useful life" of the Product as represented by Defendant.

1 120. Due to the defective nature of the Product, it is not sufficiently durable to serve
2 as flooring. The following photographs depict some of the problems Plaintiffs and others have
3 experienced with the Product.



23 121. Because of the relatively small size of the typical damages, and the modest
24 resources of most homeowners and of the individual Class Members, it is unlikely that most
25 Class Members could afford to seek recovery against Defendant on their own. A class action is
26
27

1 therefore the only viable, economical, and rational means for Class Members to recover from
 2 Defendant for the damages they have caused.

3 **I. Defendant's Knowledge of and Notice that its Flooring was Defective**

4 122. Defendant is well aware of the problems related to the cracking, splitting,
 5 warping, cupping, scratching, and denting of the Product. It has received warranty claims and
 6 complaints from customers (like those submitted by the Named Plaintiffs). In addition,
 7 websites such as www.mythreecents.com and www.consumeraffairs.com contain complaints
 8 about the Product dating back to 2011 and 2012 – which further continue to put the Defendant
 9 on notice concerning the defective nature of the Product.

10 123. Upon information and belief, Defendant pays to be a member of
 11 www.consumeraffairs.com, which means that it is notified of each complaint and has the option
 12 of responding to each complaint. A review of this website demonstrates that Defendant does
 13 review and respond to customer posts on www.consumeraffairs.com.

14 124. The following is an example of a complaint about the Product from October 2,
 15 2013 on www.consumeraffairs.com/homeowners/lumber_liquidators.html?page=12 (last
 16 visited December 16, 2015):

17 Judy of Ione, CA

18 Oct. 2, 2013 Verified Reviewer

19 We purchased dark stranded bamboo flooring from Lumber
 20 Liquidators. We were very particular to request a very durable
 21 floor that would not scratch easily and had the best resistance for
 22 moisture spills etc. This flooring was highly recommended by
 23 their salesman as one of the most durable. We installed this
 24 flooring throughout our entire downstairs living room, dining
 25 room, and kitchen. This flooring now has scratches everywhere!!
 26 Scratches from everything and anything that is slid across the
 27 floor such as: unoccupied bar stools that have protective plastic
 caps, TV trays that were only slid forward enough to allow us to
 eat while sitting on the couch, and even an empty 5 gallon bucket
 when slid a couple of inches. There are many, many scratches all
 over the house and we have no idea how they got there.

1 All of these scratches show up as bright white lines on the dark
 2 flooring which obviously was not treated well enough to make
 3 the surface as durable as we were told. We have no pets, no
 4 children at home, no high heels, and all of the heavy furniture
 5 have the felt pads to protect from scratching the floor. The
 6 flooring was only installed in April/May of this year. We have a
 7 thirty year warranty on the flooring and have called the Lumber
 8 Liquidators customer services department to complain about the
 9 flooring and see what they will do to honor the product warranty.

10 We are waiting for Lumber Liquidators to get back to us. How
 11 disappointing to spend so much money on a product
 12 recommended by Lumber Liquidators sales and yet it absolutely
 13 does not meet the standards we requested. DO NOT BUY FROM
 14 LUMBER LIQUIDATORS!!!! They sell less than quality
 15 materials!!!!

16 125. The following complaints are also from www.consumeraffairs.com and relate to
 17 complaints made to Defendant between 2011 and 2013:

18 I purchased \$6000 of morningstar bamboo from Lumber
 19 Liquidators in Jan 2012 and \$3000 more in adjacent room on
 20 same floor in April 2012. Approximately 6 months after
 21 installation the \$6000 floor began to show gaps and shrinkage.
 22 The 2nd installation has been trouble free. I contacted the LL
 23 store and they said not our problem. Contacted LL customer
 24 service and they told me it was my fault due to humidity levels in
 25 my home. If that were the case the \$3000 floor would also show
 26 gaps and shrinkage since they are next to each other! Their
 27 salesman never mentioned any problem with this wood and
 humidity. Salesman said the wood was "tougher than oak". What
 a lie! It scratches plenty! They offered \$200 on a \$1000 repair
 contingent on me waving any future claims. What a joke!¹

Can someone please tell me if there is a group from here in Texas
 that is getting together to bring a class action against LL? We
 purchased 1200 sq. ft. of Morning Star Bamboo Flooring in
 November and it is cupping EVERYWHERE. We came home
 from being gone over the weekend and now it is actually
 buckling up. From EVERYTHING I have read, it is defective
 product we were sold and do NOT expect to get any help from

¹ https://www.consumeraffairs.com/homeowners/lumber_liquidators.html?page=9 (last visited December 16, 2015).

1 LL. As of now, they have been completely useless in taking care
 2 of my problem floor. I WILL continue to go through the motions
 3 to hopefully get my money for the flooring refunded and the cost
 4 to have it pulled up reimbursed!!! I do NOT want this junk in my
 5 home. If anyone has information, please forward it to me. When
 you hire a lawyer for something like this, does LL have to pay the
 attorney or do you have to? I do NOT have the money to hire and
 pay an attorney.²

6 Lost first level contents and flooring from Sandy. January 2013,
 7 made purchase of 800 sq ft of Morning Star Bamboo, \$3661.78.
 8 Had their installers, Palermo to home to inspect and recommend
 9 how and when to install (another \$1100). Had delivery, allowed
 10 floor to acclimate for specified 3-5 days. Their installers returned
 11 to install. By end of March, had some gaps. Called Lumber
 12 Liquidators, they called installers. Was assured that with full year
 13 of warranty for installation and product, allow it to go thru
 14 summer months. July noticed scratches. While scratches are
 15 normal, these were white, not the bamboo color. Made claim to
 16 LL, was told to mail balance of floor for inspection. They
 17 received, said floor not at fault, never returned floor. Dec 2013,
 18 gaps grew to over 1/2 inch, separation from walls. Called Lumber
 19 Liquidators. Made claim on Dec. 2, repeated claim on Dec 13,
 20 2013. January 17th, began follow up and no one called us.
 21 Googled issue online. Found we were one of many. Inspections
 22 began from LL and their installers, Palermo. They agreed
 23 separation not normal - many homes in area with issue. Went to
 24 two of the LL stores. They agreed with issue and fault of floor
 25 and had numerous issues with customers and made changes to
 26 how they sell and allow acclimation of product. Three inspections
 27 were done, no issue at home cited. March inspection found
 moisture level now low in home. They are now blaming us. No
 one has record of 3 other inspections. Our gaps are all thru home
 from the front door on. As large as 1 inch in some spots.
 Unsightly and embarrassing. We had none of these issues with
 our floor before Sandy in its 5 year life. It is not our home, it is
 the product. Lumber Liquidators knows it. Every salesperson you
 ask in their store in my NY area cautions the purchaser not to buy
 this product. I don't know if the product was too wet when
 manufactured, or too dry or from endangered Tiger habitat as

² https://www.consumeraffairs.com/homeowners/lumber_liquidators.html?page=10 (last visited December 16, 2015).

1 stated online, but we are so frustrated and embarrassed by our
2 home's floor every day.”³

3 I bought 1000 square feet of Morning Star Bamboo from Lumber
4 Liquidators in November 2011 after consulting with the sales
5 associates in the Perrysburg, OH store. We received the product,
6 allowed it to acclimate indoors for several weeks and then had it
7 installed by the installer recommended by the company. About
8 one month later, the floor began to gap, snap, crackle and pop all
9 over the place. Our installer could not be reached for some time. I
10 called the store that referred me to corporate. The proper
11 warranty protocol was followed and several weeks later, nothing!
12 The customer service rep is mysteriously gone and no one will
13 help. Unreturned phone calls and emails continue. I need to list
14 my home to sell in the next month, meanwhile my floor is
15 disintegrating.⁴

16 126. In fact, on information and belief, Defendant started excluding any negative
17 reviews from its own website starting in at least 2010.

18 127. Other websites include similar customer complaints. For instance, on
19 <http://www.trulia.com>, there is a string of complaints concerning almost immediate failure of
20 the Product and related ignored warranty claims:

21 **crabbyburton, Home Buyer, Basking Ridge, NJ**

22 I am having the same problem! House is bone dry- yet after 6
23 months our floor looks awful, the edges are cupping and the
24 boards are the finish is bubbling and cracking. Looks awful!! I
25 have filed a warranty claim but haven't heard back-

26 Fri Nov 29, 2013⁵

27 **somis53, Home Buyer, 11727**

28 I had the exact same problem as you. I was told by the sales
29 person that it would be great on a cement slab. Within 3 to 4
30 months Joints separated, floor cupped and in certain areas
31 discolored, got very dark. When I called lumber liq. they said it

32 ³ https://www.consumeraffairs.com/homeowners/lumber_liquidators.html?page=10 (last visited December 16,
33 2015).

34 ⁴ http://www.consumeraffairs.com/homeowners/lumber_liquidators.html?page=14 (last visited December 16,
35 2015).

36 ⁵ [http://www.trulia.com/voices/Remodel_and_Renovate/Has_anyone_tried_the_bamboo_floors_from_lumber_liq-
37 51225](http://www.trulia.com/voices/Remodel_and_Renovate/Has_anyone_tried_the_bamboo_floors_from_lumber_liq-51225) (last visited December 16, 2015).

1 shouldn't have been installed on a slab because of the moisture.
 2 They took no responsibility and blamed it on the installer. And
 3 now I'm concerned about the amount of formaldehyde it
 4 contains.⁶

5 Sun Mar 1, 2015

6 128. Indeed, Defendant's conduct shows actual notice and knowledge of the
 7 Product's defects as it responded directly to complaints and attempted to attribute reported
 8 problems on installation issues. For instance, in 2012, Defendant responded to a complaint
 9 posted on [http://lumber-liquidators.pissedconsumer.com/buyer-beware-defective-product-](http://lumber-liquidators.pissedconsumer.com/buyer-beware-defective-product-lumber-liquidators-20120328308399.html)
 10 [lumber-liquidators-20120328308399.html](http://lumber-liquidators.pissedconsumer.com/buyer-beware-defective-product-lumber-liquidators-20120328308399.html) (last visited December 16, 2015):

11 **Dir. Customer Care _ LL Mar 31, 2012**

12 Sales associates answer questions and offer guidance as needed.
 13 A final choice is made by a consumer when they agree and
 14 purchase material, so staff never makes anyone buy any
 15 particular item, but advises them based on exchanges of
 16 information during the sales process. The FINAL DECISION for
 17 any flooring installation no matter where you shop comes from
 18 the installers onsite assessment of the project. Your installer
 19 (Joseph) is ultimately responsible for a projects needs and we
 20 noted on 3.20.12 that he never read the instructions, so the
 21 qualified installer was not properly educated to install this
 22 material as evident in your complaint. This is publicly verifiable
 23 on our website (Customer Care page) where the installation
 24 instructions can be viewed to support the above mentioned
 25 statement. Michelle from Customer Relations is well educated
 26 and capable. The dimpling is not an ongoing problem, rather the
 27 result of improper installation as noted the installer did not read
 this information until the problem surfaced. The instructions state
 (one of several examples) "Owner and installer are solely and
 jointly responsible for site conditions, pre-installation moisture
 checking of new floor and subfloor and must ensure that all
 conditions and specifications listed in this guide have been
 thoroughly met prior to Installation of hardwood floor." The
 installers likely upset for failing to read the document because he
 failed to follow direction, so this is an installation concern and we
 do not fix installer mistakes as we're not responsible for
 independent installer errors" Not [*sic*] supplier ever is. A good

⁶*Id.*

1 reputation is earned when directions are reviewed and adhered to,
 2 so we disagree with your assessment of his credentials in this
 3 case. Unfortunately, this is not a product defect but installer error
 4 meaning it's not covered under the warranty. The other product
 5 installed was obviously conducted following direction as an
 6 example of what a floor can look like when instructions are
 7 followed. Sorry to hear this happened. We sell thousands of
 8 bamboo floors each week without issue and the return business
 9 alone accounts for most of these sales. People are satisfied when
 10 the instructions are followed and this is a terrible way to learn the
 importance of those documents. Yes " Everyone be aware to
 review the warranty and the install instructions to avoid this from
 happening on your project. We're taking additional steps April to
 provide even more information about what a consumer can do to
 further help avoid these situations from happening. Always check
 installer references and oversee the project so the job meets your
 satisfaction within the first 25% installed at a minimum.

11 129. On information and belief, to date, Defendant continues to review customer
 12 complaints online and, instead of offering reasonable remedies for customers, responds by
 13 blaming defects with the Product on care and/or installation:

14 **LLResponse, Just Looking, Toano, VA**

15 LL Response: Reviewing the dated and current postings we find a
 16 need for consumer education to understand how flooring is to be
 17 cared for before, during, and after installation. Installing flooring
 18 without reviewing the installation instructions or failing to review
 19 the credentials of their hired installers is never recommended and
 20 leads to problems. If you rely solely on the installer to make all
 21 the project decisions on your behalf is a common mistake and
 22 complaining about board selection, quality of work and care
 23 given to the floor during the process can all be avoided by being
 24 present and overseeing the work performed. We make every
 25 effort to educate consumers and the one thing about the flooring
 26 business is all flooring products require the same type of
 27 acclimation, pre-installation testing, installation technique, proper
 application of the floor to include moisture protection, and finally
 proper ongoing maintenance of the floor to include temperature
 and humidity controls. A common theme with gapping concerns
 stems from customers refusing to install transitions for floating
 floor systems, or improper application of transitions such as T-
 moldings allowing the floor to expand and contract as designed.
 Application of the floor is just as important as choosing the color
 or style of flooring for your home. We can ask questions at the

point of sale, but ultimately the installer has the final say on whether the floor type is the right one for the scope of your project. Hire a professional with the installation backed by a warranty, but know that a product warranty covers the finish wearing down to the wood layer, or core as it may be. Scratches, dents, chipping, cupping, buckling and other issues are not a covered event and point to other installation and care issues. This does not change when you shop somewhere else and the best advice is to read the warranty, follow the instructions, hire a flooring contractor not a general contractor to install your floor, and follow the care instructions. Thousands of people shop everyday with us and have a wonderful experience. Choosing the right floor and caring for it after installation leads to complete satisfaction with a warranty that covers finish wear through the period offered. Flooring requires care like any other investment, so please visit our site for more information or assistance if you have questions. It can be rather frustrating to get flooring advice from others who may not have taken the proper steps to install the floor, or care for it according to the instructions. If you need assistance please locate the Customer Care tab on the upper right hand corner of our main web page, or call 1800HARDWOOD.

Wed May 7, 2014

LLResponse, Just Looking, Toano, VA

The warranty does not cover scratches or dents - no flooring warranty does - this is a care issue and not something a manufacturer or seller pays for. I have a scratch on my car and don't expect Ford to pay for the repair. This is a matter of understanding what you are responsible for versus the seller.

Wed May 7, 2014

130. Similarly, the Better Business Bureau ("BBB") website reports that, since 2013, 819 complaints against Defendant have been resolved, and 605 complaints against Defendant remain unresolved, some of which relate to the defective nature of the Product.

131. Like www.consumeraffairs.com, the BBB notifies Defendant of each complaint and Defendant has the option of responding to the consumer making the complaint.

132. On information and belief, Defendant's CEO was put on notice that the company is knowingly selling a product containing defects and his response was to issue a refund without demanding the customer go through the warranty process:

Morning Star bamboo flooring from LL seems to be a major issue. I installed 1800sqft using a licensed flooring contractor after labor day 2014. I left the product on studs inside the house in an empty room for over a month as directed by salesman at LL; with a fan blowing from the floor and ceiling fan above. I cut off the ends of the boxes also as directed. Within a week; the floor started to cup in the dining room in front of the china cabinet and is now cupping at various places throughout the house. LL customer service replied to my letter of complaint with the same reply; cupping is caused from moisture above and below the wood. We installed with MS adhesive directly to prepared concrete pad of house we just purchased. Seems to me LL is knowingly selling product that has systemic issues. I wrote to the CEO about being charged "restocking" fee on \$10,000 purchase. I was not happy to be charged because I ended up with 14 extras cartons with only 1 carton that was waste. Installer wasted very little product. CEO issued a refund to us after he received a letter. In my opinion and 35 years in retail management; this is product liability. I am writing to the CEO now to voice my disgust. I also believe LL is knowingly selling "wet" NOT KILN DRIED product. 2 flooring contractors independently walked my home and stated installation was done correctly in there [sic.] opinion. I believe legal action will be necessary. I don't think the CEO will venture from their customer support teams reply.⁷

J. Defendant's Warranty Practices and Procedures Also Put Them on Notice of the Products' Defects

133. When consumers complaint to their local Lumber Liquidators store about the Product's defects, they are directed to contact the corporate customer care department for assistance.

134. Defendant's corporate customer care department has each customer fill out a "General Disclosure Statement," which includes a description of the Product, its mill code and production date, how long it was acclimatized, whether it was installed professionally, and a description of the defects that have appeared.

135. Defendant then determines whether to order an inspection of the flooring or not.

⁷ <http://www.4inspirationsphotographyblog.com/suzanne-mcgrath-photograp/2013/04/a-product-review-morningstar-bamboo-click-floors.html> (last visited January 16, 2015).

136. Inevitably, Defendant determines that the defects complained of are the result of poor installation and denies the claim. *See, e.g.*, ¶¶ 155, 156, 158-60, *supra*.

137. Indeed, after this Complaint was publicized 64 comments were received, including the following two about Product purchased in 2013 that describe Defendant's practice of always blaming the consumer:

Purchased 1400 S.F. of Morningstar carbonized strand bamboo in July 2013 and had it professionally installed by their installer. Same problems as everyone else speaks of. Worst problems are shrinking and gaps. Still continues to shrink a year and a half later. Went through entire claim process with Lumber Liquidators. Arbitrarily turned down at every step. Paid for two different professional flooring inspectors, and on their advice paid for professional re-installs of large sections twice. Shrinking and gaps continue to happen. I have detailed and contemporaneous notes on all events and conversations, and would like to be part of the class action suit.⁸

I have had the same issue with my LL Morning Star Bamboo flooring (we had over 2000 sqft installed). The floors began to warp and buckle within 3 months after installation in October 2013. I went through the entire claim process with LL and received a letter from them informing me that the issue with my flooring has nothing to do with the product itself and everything to do with a moisture issue (despite purchasing the most expensive moisture barrier/adhesive they sell). They will take NO responsibility for anything. I have fought with the installer and my contractor, and am now purchasing new flooring and working out the rest with my contractor. I am now concerned about the formaldehyde. I have a neurological condition and cannot have this s*&t in my home!!! Please send me some information as to what I can do, and whether ALL of the flooring needs to come out.⁹

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

138. Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action pursuant to Rule 23(b)(2) and Rule 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of themselves and the class. This

⁸ <http://topclassactions.com/lawsuit-settlements/lawsuit-news/45644-lumber-liquidators-facing-bamboo-flooring-class-action/> (last visited December 16, 2015).

⁹ *Id.*

1 action satisfies the numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy, predominance, and
 2 superiority requirements as set forth in Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3).

3 139. Plaintiffs advance this action on behalf of the following classes (together, the
 4 “Class” or “Class Members”):

5 California Class: All individuals in the State of California who
 6 purchased, for personal, family, or household use, Morning Star
 7 Strand Bamboo Flooring manufactured and sold by Lumber
 8 Liquidators, Inc. from January 1, 2008 to present. Excluded from
 9 the Class are Defendants, their legal representatives, assigns and
 10 successors and any entity in which Defendants have a controlling
 11 interest. Also excluded is the judge to whom this case is assigned
 12 and any member of the judge’s immediate family and judicial
 13 staff.

14 Illinois Class: All individuals in the State of Illinois who
 15 purchased, for personal, family, or household use, Morning Star
 16 Strand Bamboo Flooring manufactured and sold by Lumber
 17 Liquidators, Inc. from January 1, 2008 to present. Excluded from
 18 the Class are Defendants, their legal representatives, assigns and
 19 successors and any entity in which Defendants have a controlling
 20 interest. Also excluded is the judge to whom this case is assigned
 21 and any member of the judge’s immediate family and judicial
 22 staff.

23 West Virginia Class: All individuals in the State of West
 24 Virginia who purchased, for personal, family, or household use,
 25 Morning Star Strand Bamboo Flooring manufactured and sold by
 26 Lumber Liquidators, Inc. from January 1, 2008 to present.
 27 Excluded from the Class are Defendants, their legal
 representatives, assigns and successors and any entity in which
 Defendants have a controlling interest. Also excluded is the
 judge to whom this case is assigned and any member of the
 judge’s immediate family and judicial staff.

Minnesota Class: All individuals in the State of Minnesota who
 purchased, for personal, family, or household use, Morning Star
 Strand Bamboo Flooring manufactured and sold by Lumber
 Liquidators, Inc. from January 1, 2008 to present. Excluded from
 the Class are Defendants, their legal representatives, assigns and
 successors and any entity in which Defendants have a controlling
 interest. Also excluded is the judge to whom this case is assigned
 and any member of the judge’s immediate family and judicial
 staff.

Pennsylvania Class: All individuals in the State of Pennsylvania who purchased, for personal, family, or household use, Morning Star Strand Bamboo Flooring manufactured and sold by Lumber Liquidators, Inc. from January 1, 2008 to present. Excluded from the Class are Defendants, their legal representatives, assigns and successors and any entity in which Defendants have a controlling interest. Also excluded is the judge to whom this case is assigned and any member of the judge's immediate family and judicial staff.

Florida Class: All individuals in the State of Florida who purchased, for personal, family, or household use, Morning Star Strand Bamboo Flooring manufactured and sold by Lumber Liquidators, Inc. from January 1, 2008 to present. Excluded from the Class are Defendants, their legal representatives, assigns and successors and any entity in which Defendants have a controlling interest. Also excluded is the judge to whom this case is assigned and any member of the judge's immediate family and judicial staff.

Claims for personal injury are specifically excluded from the Class.

140. Numerosity (Rule 23(a)(1)). Although the actual size of the Classes is uncertain, Plaintiffs are informed and believes the Classes are comprised of many of thousands of property owners, making joinder impractical. The disposition of the claims of these Class Members in a single class action will provide substantial benefits to all parties and to the Court.

141. Communality (Rule 23(a)(2)). There exist questions of law and fact common to all Class Members. Common questions include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. Whether the Product is subject to premature failure well in advance of its represented thirty-year useful life;

b. Whether the Product is not suitable for use as a long-term flooring product;

c. Whether Defendant knew, or should have known, of the defective nature of the Product before making available for purchase and use by the Plaintiffs and Class Members;

1 d. Whether Defendant failed to disclose to Plaintiffs and Class Members
2 the defective nature of the Product;

3 e. Whether Defendant, through making misleading representations of
4 material facts regarding the Product's hardness and omitting other material facts regarding the
5 particular susceptibility of the Product to cupping, warping, scratching, denting, and other
6 defects, had a duty to disclose full information regarding the Product's characteristics;

7 f. Whether Defendant's failure to disclose material facts violated Business
8 Professions Code Section 17200;

9 g. Whether Defendant's warranty practices, by repeatedly concealing the
10 true nature of the defects in the Product through the use of diversionary tactics and false
11 investigative reports, violated Business & Professions Code Section 17200;

12 h. Whether Defendant's failure to inform purchasers that the Product was
13 susceptible to the failures alleged herein was a material omission, the nondisclosure of which
14 was a deceptive sales practice under the consumer protection statutes of applicable state law;

15 i. Whether Defendant owed a duty to Plaintiffs and Class Members to
16 exercise reasonable and ordinary care in the testing, design, production, manufacturing,
17 warranting and marketing of the Product;

18 j. Whether Defendant breached its duties to the Plaintiffs and Class
19 Members by designing, manufacturing, producing, marketing, advertising, and selling defective
20 flooring to Plaintiffs and Class Members;

21 k. Whether Defendant had a duty to Plaintiffs and Class Members to
22 disclose the true nature of the Product;

23 l. Whether the facts not disclosed by Defendant to Plaintiffs and Class
24 Member are material facts;

1 m. Whether Defendant knew, or should have known that the Product would
2 prematurely fail, is not suitable for use as flooring in residences or businesses, and is otherwise
3 is not as represented by Defendant;

4 n. Whether Defendant violated California's Consumers Legal Remedies
5 Act (California Civil Code § 1750 *et seq.*), when it concealed, made partial misleading
6 representations, or failed to disclose the true nature of the Product, and led consumers to
7 believe, through its advertising, warranties, and other express representations that the Product
8 had characteristics that it did not actually have;

9 o. Whether, in committing the acts alleged herein, Defendant engaged in
10 unfair competition and in an unfair business practice or practices within the meaning of
11 California Business and Professions Code § 17200;

12 p. Whether such acts or practices were illegal, unfair, or fraudulent within
13 the meaning of California Business and Professions Code § 17200;

14 q. Whether Plaintiffs and Class Members are entitled to compensatory
15 damages, restitution, and the amounts thereof respectively;

16 r. Whether Defendant should be declared financially responsible for
17 notifying all Class Members of the defective Product and for the costs and expenses of repair
18 and replacement of all defective flooring materials and providing restitution of monies paid and
19 inadequate value given;

20 s. Whether Defendant should be ordered to disgorge, for the benefit of
21 Class Members, all or part of their ill-gotten profits received from the sale of defective Product
22 and/or to make full restitution to Plaintiffs and Class Members; and

23 t. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from continuing to market the
24 Product, as defined herein, utilizing misleading misrepresentations and omission of material
25 facts.

1 142. Typicality (Rule 23(a)(3)). The claim of the representative Plaintiffs are typical
2 of the claims of Class Members, in that the representative Plaintiffs, like all Class Members,
3 own a structure in which the defective Product was installed and failed prematurely. The
4 representative Plaintiffs, like all Class Members, have suffered a common injury: Plaintiffs
5 will incur the cost of repairing and/or replacing the defective Product in their homes and
6 repairing any resultant consequential damage to other building components. The factual basis
7 of Defendant's misconduct is common to all Class Members.

8 143. Adequacy (Rule 23(a)(4)). Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and
9 protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiffs have retained counsel with substantial experience in
10 prosecuting consumer class actions, including actions involving defective building products,
11 failure to disclose material information regarding product performance, and violation of
12 consumer protection statutes. Plaintiffs and their counsel are committed to vigorously
13 prosecuting this action on behalf of the Class and have the financial resources to do so. Neither
14 Plaintiffs nor their counsel have any interests adverse to those of the Class.

15 144. Predominance of Common Questions (Rule 23(b)(3)). Common questions of
16 law and fact predominant over any questions involving individualized analysis.
17 Fundamentally, there are no material questions of fact or law that are not common to Class
18 Members. Common issues of fact include: All Class Members purchased the same Product and
19 received the same misrepresentations, evasions, and omissions. The performance of the
20 Product relative to its represented qualities is a common question, as is the Defendant's
21 knowledge regarding the Product performance and Defendant's uniform omission to Class
22 Members of these material facts. Common questions of law include whether Defendant's
23 conduct violates California's consumer protection statutes and other law, and the Class
24 Members' entitlement to damages and remedies.

25 145. Superiority (Rule 23(b)(3)). Plaintiffs and Class Members have all suffered and
26 will continue to suffer harm and damages as a result of Defendant's unlawful and wrongful
27

1 conduct. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
2 adjudication of the subject controversy. Because of the relatively small size of the individual
3 Class Members' claims, most Class Members likely would find the cost of litigating their
4 individual claims to be prohibitive and will have no effective remedy at law. Thus, absent a
5 class action, Class Members will continue to incur damages and Defendant's misconduct will
6 proceed without remedy. The class treatment of common questions of law and fact is also
7 superior to multiple individual actions or piecemeal litigation in that it conserves the resources
8 of the courts and the litigants and promotes consistency and efficiency of adjudication. There
9 is no impediment to the management of this action because of the virtual identity of the
10 common questions of law and fact to all Class Members.

11 146. Injunctive Relief (Rule 23(b)(2)). Defendant has engaged and continues to
12 engage in business practices which are unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent in violation of
13 California's Unfair Competition Law (Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*) and the
14 False Advertising Law (Business & Professions Code §§ 17500 *et seq.*) by, among other things,
15 advertising and representing that the Product has characteristics and benefits that it does not.

16 147. Plaintiffs seek class-wide injunctive relief on grounds consistent with the
17 standards articulated in Rule 23(b)(2) that establish final injunctive relief as an appropriate
18 class-wide remedy, in that Defendant continues to advertise the Product, continues to provide
19 half-truths and misleading information about the Product, and continues to omit to disclose
20 material facts regarding the Product.

ESTOPPEL FROM PLEADING THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

148. Defendant knew or reasonably should have known that the Product was defective before its sale. Defendant intentionally concealed material truths and disclosed half-truths while at the same time concealing material information that would have corrected consumers' perceptions, concerning the Product from the general public and Class Members, while continuing to falsely represent that the Product is fit for its intended use.

149. Defendant affirmatively represented to the general public the Product carried a thirty-year (30) warranty. Through these representations, Defendant created a reasonable expectation among ordinary consumers and in the construction trades that the Product would have a useful life of at least thirty (30) years.

150. Defendant's acts of fraudulent concealment also include, but are not limited to, using improper warranty tactics and commissioning sham inspections of Class Members' flooring in response to complaints in order to mislead consumers as to the cause of the Product's failures and the true nature of the Product defects.

151. Based upon Defendant's misrepresentations and concealment, Defendant is equitably estopped from asserting a statute-of-limitations defense.

152. Alternatively, to the extent Defendant pursued a common policy of diverting warranty claims or other consumer complaints about the Product through misleading and erroneous investigation, or delaying tactics that induced Plaintiffs or Class Members to not assert their rights in a timely manner, Defendant is equitably estopped from asserting a statute-of-limitations defense.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Violation of Consumers Legal Remedies Act (“CLRA”))

153. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

154. Defendant and the Doe Defendants are “persons” as defined by California Civil Code §1761(c).

155. Defendant engaged in unfair competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices in violation of California Civil Code §1770(a)(5) and (a)(7) when Defendant represented, through its advertising and other express representations, that the Product had benefits or characteristics that it did not actually have and when Defendant made misleading statements about the Product’s hardness without further disclosing that factors other than the Product’s hardness can lead to the Product easily scratching and denting and manifesting other defects complained of by Plaintiffs and Class Members. Defendant further violated the CLRA when Defendant falsely represented that the Product was of a particular standard or quality. Finally, Defendant violated the CLRA when it advertised the Product with the intent not to sell it as advertised.

156. Defendant’s deceptive practices were specifically designed to induce Plaintiffs and Class Members to purchase the Product. Defendant engaged in marketing efforts as detailed in the general allegations, to reach Class Members, their agents, and/or third parties on whom they relied to persuade them to purchase and install the Product manufactured by Defendant, or to purchase homes and other structures in which the defective Product manufactured by Defendant has been installed.

157. To this day, Defendant continues to engage in unlawful practices in violation of the CLRA. Defendant continues to conceal the defective nature of the Product, make misleading statements about the Product, and has omitted to disclose, on inquiry from Plaintiffs and Class Members, the Product’s defective propensities.

158. Plaintiffs served Defendant with notice of their violation of the CLRA by serving notice on their General Counsel by certified mail to their corporate offices, on September 3, 2014. A copy of this notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and for all others similarly situated, demand a permanent injunction be issued against Defendant to refrain from continued advertising of the Product at issue herein that omits material facts about product performance, injunctive relief forcing Defendant to replace and repair all Product at issue herein for Class Members, consequential damages for Class Members who have replaced or will replace the Product at issue herein, plus costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to California Civil Code §1780(d).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Unfair Competition Law- Unlawful Business Practice)

159. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

160. California Business and Professions Code §17200 *et seq.* prohibits acts of unfair competition, which includes unlawful business practices.

161. Defendant engaged in unlawful business practices in that Defendant represented, through its advertising, warranties, and other express representations that the Product had characteristics it did not actually have and provided misleading information to Plaintiffs and Class Members about the Product while omitting to disclose information about other characteristics of the Product that cause it to scratch and dent easily and manifest other defects.

162. Defendant violated § 17200 when Defendant falsely represented the Product was of a particular standard or quality, including representations that the Product met industry standards, "virtually scratch and dent resistant," and "two to two and a half times harder than red oak." Defendant further violated the Unfair Competition Law when it unlawfully tested,

1 designed, manufactured, formulated, sold, and introduced in the stream of commerce for
2 purchase by Plaintiffs, Class Members, and the general public, the defective Product.

3 163. Defendant's deceptive practices constitute an unlawful business practice in that
4 the practices were specifically designed to induce Plaintiffs, Class Members, and their agents or
5 third parties upon whom Plaintiffs and Class Members' relied to provide appropriate guidance
6 regarding suitable flooring products, to purchase on Class Members' behalf the Product and
7 install the Product, recommend the use of the Product, or to purchase homes and other
8 structures in which the Product has been installed.

9 164. To this day, Defendant has engaged and continues to engage in unlawful
10 business practices by concealing the defective nature of the Product and have knowingly
11 misrepresented to Class Members the Product possess qualities and characteristics it does not
12 have.

13 165. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's unfair and unlawful methods of
14 competition and unfair, deceptive or unlawful acts or practices, Plaintiffs and Class Members
15 have suffered actual damages in that they own homes and other structures on which defective
16 Product is or was installed. The Product has failed and will continue to prematurely fail due to
17 its poor design, poor manufacture, and unsuitability for its intended purpose, which will require
18 (or has already required) Plaintiffs and Class Members to incur costs to prematurely repair
19 and/or replace their floorings.

20 166. As a proximate result of their unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent practices,
21 Defendant has been unjustly enriched and should be required to make restitution to the
22 Plaintiffs and Class Members pursuant to §§ 17203 and 17204 of the California Business &
23 Professions Code.

(Violation of Unfair Competition Law – Unfair Business Practice)

168. Defendant engaged in an unfair business practice by failing to disclose material facts concerning the Product, and representing, through advertising, warranties and other representations that the Product had particular qualities, including, that the Product met industry standards, “does not scratch easily,” and is “two to two and a half times harder than red oak,” all qualities that were inconsistent with Defendant’s knowledge of Product performance.

169. Defendant’s “unfair” practices were designed to induce Plaintiffs and Class Members, or their agents, and/or third parties upon whom Plaintiffs and Class Members relied to provide appropriate flooring products, to purchase and install the Product, recommend the use of the Product, or to purchase homes and other structures on which the Product has been installed.

170. To this day, Defendant has failed to disclose facts concerning the Product performance, facts that would be and are material to the consumer or those third parties, such as flooring contractors and general contractors, on whom the consumer relies.

171. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices, Plaintiffs and Class Members have suffered actual damages in that they own homes and other structures in which defective Product is or was installed. The Product will prematurely fail due to inadequate product testing, poor design

1 and/or manufacturing techniques, and poor installation guidelines, which will require Plaintiffs
 2 and Class Members to incur costs to prematurely repair and/or replace their flooring.

3 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Violation of Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act)**

5 172. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all
 6 preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

7 173. The conduct described in this Complaint constitutes a violation of the Illinois
 8 Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act, 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. 505/1 *et seq.* (the
 9 “CFA”), and substantially similar state consumer protection statutes.

10 174. Defendant engaged in unfair or deceptive practices in violation of the CFA when
 11 it (1) represented that the Product was ASTM acceptable when, at best, it lacked credible
 12 evidence to support those claims, and, at worst, knew the Product would fail prematurely, was
 13 not suitable for use as flooring, and otherwise was not as warranted and represented by
 14 Defendant; (2) failed to disclose to, or concealed from, consumers, installers, and distributors
 15 material facts about the defective nature of the Product; (3) failed to disclose its own
 16 knowledge of the defective nature of the Product; and (4) limited its warranty obligations in an
 17 unfair and unconscionable way in light of its failure to disclose the defective nature of the
 18 Product.

19 175. Defendant either knew or should have known its Product was defective, would
 20 fail prematurely, and was not as warranted and represented by Defendant.

21 176. Defendant’s conduct and omissions described herein repeatedly occurred in
 22 Defendant’s trade or business and were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the
 23 consuming public.

24 177. The facts concealed or not disclosed by Defendant are material facts in that
 25 Plaintiff Ference, Illinois Class Members, and any reasonable consumer would have considered
 26 those facts important in deciding whether to purchase the Product or purchase homes or
 27 structures with flooring applying the Product. Had Plaintiff Ference and Illinois Class

Members known the Product was defective (and did not meet ASTM or other flooring industry standards), they would not have purchased the Product or they would have either negotiated additional warranty coverage, negotiated a lower price to reflect the risk or simply avoided the risk all together by purchasing different flooring products.

178. Defendant intended that Plaintiff Ference and Illinois Class Members would rely on the deception by purchasing its Product, unaware of the undisclosed material facts. Defendant knew that Plaintiff Ference and Illinois Class Members would rely on its product literature and advertisements, statements made by its salespeople and other representations. This conduct constitutes consumer fraud within the meaning of the various consumer protection statutes.

179. Defendant's unlawful conduct is continuing, with no indication that Defendant will cease.

180. As a direct and proximate result of the deceptive, misleading, unfair, and unconscionable practices of Defendant set forth above, Plaintiff Ference and Illinois Class Members are entitled to actual damages, compensatory damages, penalties, and attorney's fees and costs as set forth in Section 10a of the CFA.

181. The Defendant's deceptive, misleading, unfair and unconscionable practices set forth above were done willfully, wantonly and maliciously entitling Plaintiff Ference and Illinois Class Members to an award of punitive damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as hereinafter set forth.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Violation of Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices & Consumer Protection Law)

182. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

183. This Count is brought by Plaintiff Fursman on behalf of himself and Pennsylvania Class Members.

1 184. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff Fursman and Pennsylvania Class Members
2 were “persons” within the meaning of 73 P.S. § 201-2(3).

3 185. Defendant’s conduct, as alleged herein, constituted unfair or deceptive acts or
4 practices and unfair methods of competition in trade or commerce (within the meaning of
5 73 P.S. § 201-2(4)), in violation of 73 P.S. § 201-3, and regulations promulgated thereunder,
6 including the following types of conduct specified in 73 P.S. § 201-2:

7 a. Representing that goods or services have characteristics or ingredients
8 that they do not have (§ 201-2(vi));

9 b. Representing that goods are of a particular standard, quality or grade, if
10 they are of another (§ 201-2(vii));

11 c. Advertising goods or services with intent not to sell them as advertised
12 (§ 201-2(ix)); and

13 d. Engaging in fraudulent or deceptive conduct that creates a likelihood of
14 confusion or misunderstanding (§ 201-2(xxi)).

15 186. Defendant’s unfair and deceptive acts and practices (including conduct
16 prohibited by the provisions cited in subparagraphs (a) through (e) above), as alleged in greater
17 detail herein, include, but are not limited to: (1) representations that the Product was more
18 water resistant than hardwood when, at best, it lacked credible evidence to support those
19 claims, and, at worst, knew the Product would fail prematurely, was not suitable for use as
20 flooring, and otherwise was not as represented by Defendant; (2) failed to disclose to, or
21 concealed from, consumers, installers, and distributors material facts about the defective nature
22 of the Product; and (3) failed to disclose its own knowledge of the defective nature of the
23 Product.

24 187. As a result of Defendant’s unfair and deceptive acts and practices, Plaintiff
25 Fursman and Pennsylvania Class Members have suffered ascertainable losses of money or
26 property within the meaning of 73 P.S. § 201-9.2, which they seek for restitution and/or
27

1 disgorgement of funds paid to Defendant by Plaintiff Fursman and Pennsylvania Class
 2 Members to purchase the Product, or the value of the product in their home or structure, or in
 3 the form of repair and/or replacement of the defective Product on Plaintiff Fursman's and
 4 Pennsylvania Class Members' homes and other structures.

5 188. Plaintiff Fursman and Pennsylvania Class Members are entitled to recover these
 6 actual damages or statutory damages of \$100, whichever is greater, plus multiple damages.

7 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Violation of Minnesota Consumer Fraud Act, M.S.A. § 325F.68, et seq.)**

9 189. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all
 10 preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

11 190. This Count is brought by Plaintiff Norris on behalf of herself and Minnesota
 12 Class Members.

13 191. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant was a "person" within the meaning of
 14 M.S.A. § 325F.68(3).

15 192. Defendant's conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes unlawful practices, in
 16 violation of M.S.A. § 325F.69 subd. 1, including fraud, false pretense, false promises,
 17 misrepresentations, misleading statements, and/or deceptive practices, with the intent that
 18 others rely thereon, in connection with the sale of the Product to Plaintiff Norris and Minnesota
 19 Class Members.

20 193. Defendant's unlawful practices (including fraud, misrepresentation, and
 21 deceptive practices prohibited by § 325F.69 subd. 1)), as alleged in greater detail herein,
 22 include, but are not limited to: (1) representations that the Product was not suitable for use as
 23 flooring, and otherwise was not as warranted and represented by Defendant; (2) failed to
 24 disclose to, or concealed from, consumers, installers, and distributors material facts about the
 25 defective nature of the Product; and (3) failed to disclose its own knowledge of the defective
 26 nature of the Product.
 27

196. Plaintiff Norris and Minnesota Class Members are entitled to bring an action for damages and injunctive under M.S.A. § 8.31 subd. 3a, because this action has a public benefit. The public benefit of this action is demonstrated by at least the following:

a. This action seeks injunctive relief in order to stop Defendant from continuing to engage in the fraud, false pretense, false promises, misrepresentations, misleading statements, and/or deceptive practices alleged herein, and to issue corrective statements and advertising, in an effort to protect Minnesota Class Members and members of the public; and

b. Members of the public have been and are concerned about the quality and safety of the Product, as evidenced by, among other things, the thousands of complaints by consumers that can be found on the Internet regarding its defective nature.

197. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

198. Defendant published, disseminated and/or circulated oral and written information and matter that tended to and/or did induce, directly and indirectly West Virginia

1 residents, including Plaintiff Emery and West Virginia Class Members to enter into contracts
2 and agreements to purchase the Product.

3 199. Defendant, acting directly or by agents, servants, employees, conspirators and/or
4 joint ventures set about to sell, offer for sale, and attempt to sell in West Virginia, for cash or
5 credit, the Product.

6 200. That the defendants acting as aforesaid set about to and did engage in unfair
7 methods of competition and unfair or deceptive practices as set forth in West Virginia Code 46-
8 A-6-102, including, but not limited to:

9 The act, use or employment by any person of any deception,
10 fraud, false pretense, false promise or misrepresentation, or the
11 concealment, suppression or omission of any material fact with
12 the intent that others rely upon such concealment, suppression or
13 omission, in connection with the sale or advertisement of any
14 goods or services, whether or not any person has in fact been
15 misled, deceived or damaged thereby;

16 Advertising, printing, displaying, publishing, distributing, or
17 broadcasting, or causing to be advertised, printed, displayed,
18 published, distributed or broadcast in any manner, any statement
19 or representation with regard to the sale of goods...which is false,
20 misleading, or deceptive, or which omits to state material
21 information which is necessary to make the statements therein
22 not false, misleading or deceptive;

23 Engaging in any other conduct which similarly creates a
24 likelihood of confusion or misunderstanding.

25 201. That the acts and conduct above violated West Virginia Code, Chapter 46A,
26 Article 6, Section 101, *et seq.* in that Defendant engaged in unfair and deceptive acts or
27 practices, including, but not limited to, engaging in part of a scheme or plan to sell the Product
to the public without disclosing that it was not made from the “hardest wood,” that bamboo is
not a wood but is actually a grass that is fibrous and flooring made from it is susceptible to
scratching and denting, and that the Product was not otherwise free from defects. These acts
and practices had the capacity to deceive a substantial portion of the public.

1 202. As a proximate result of the violation by defendants of the aforesaid statute,
 2 Plaintiff Emery and West Virginia Class Members suffered an ascertainable loss of money or
 3 property and Plaintiff Emery and West Virginia Class Members are entitled to recover damages
 4 all as provided in West Virginia Code, 46A-6-106.

5 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
 6 **(Violation of Florida’s Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act**
 7 **Florida Statute § 501.201 *et seq.* (“FDUTPA”))**

8 203. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all
 9 preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

10 204. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the Florida Deceptive and Unfair
 11 Trade Practices Act, Fla. Stat. § 501.201 *et seq.* The stated purpose of this Act is to “protect
 12 the consuming public . . . from those who engage in unfair methods of competition, or
 13 unconscionable, deceptive, or unfair acts or practices in the conduct of any trade or commerce.”
Id. §501.202(2).

14 205. Plaintiff Triana and Florida Class Members are “consumers” and the
 15 transactions at issue in this complaint constitute “trade or commerce” as defined by FDUTPA.
 16 *See id.* § 501.203(7)-(8).

17 206. FDUTPA declares unlawful “[u]nfair methods of competition, unconscionable
 18 acts or practices, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any trade or
 19 commerce.” *Id.* § 501.204(1)

20 207. Defendant violated FDUTPA by representing to Plaintiff Triana and Florida
 21 Class Members that the Product had particular qualities, including that the Product was “two-
 22 and-a-half times harder than hardwood flooring,” and, by virtue of being “carbonized” and/or
 23 treated “under extreme heat and pressure,” was “much harder than traditional bamboo”—when
 24 in fact Defendant knew that the Product did not possess these qualities.

25 208. Furthermore, Defendant employed fraud, deception, false promise,
 26 misrepresentation, and the knowing concealment, suppression, or omission of material facts in
 27

1 its sale and advertisement of the Product in the State of Florida by: (1) representing that the
2 Product was ASTM acceptable when, at best, Defendant lacked credible evidence to support
3 those claims, and, at worst, Defendant knew the Product would fail prematurely and was not
4 suitable for use as flooring; (2) failing to disclose to, or concealing from, consumers, installers,
5 and distributors material facts about the defective nature of the Product; and (3) failing to
6 disclose its own knowledge of the defective nature of the Product.

7 209. Plaintiff Triana and the Florida Class Members directly or indirectly relied upon
8 Defendant's representations regarding the quality of the Product in their purchase decisions.

9 210. Plaintiff Triana and the Florida Class Members were misled by Defendant's
10 misrepresentations and omissions because they believed that the Product was harder, stronger,
11 more durable, and more stable than other flooring materials and other bamboo flooring
12 products.

13 211. As a direct and proximate result of the FDUTPA violations described above,
14 Plaintiff Triana and the Florida Class Members have been injured in that they purchased the
15 defective Product or purchased homes or other structures with the defective Product, based on
16 the misrepresentations and nondisclosures of material facts alleged above.

17 212. Had Plaintiff Triana and the Florida Class Members known the defective nature
18 of the Product and the truth concerning Defendant's claims, they would not have purchased or
19 would not have paid what they did for the Product or their structures.

20 213. As a result of Defendant's practices in violation of FDUTPA, Plaintiff Triana
21 and Florida Class Members suffered an ascertainable loss in the form of monies paid to
22 Defendant for the Product that, contrary to Defendant's representations, prematurely failed.

23 214. Accordingly, Plaintiff Triana and Florida Class Members are entitled to such
24 damages, as well as equitable relief, costs, reasonable attorney's fees, and other relief, as are
25 permitted under the law.
26
27

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that the Court enter judgment against Defendant, and each of them, and in favor of Plaintiffs, and to award the following relief:

1. Certification of the following classes:
 - a. A California class and appointing Dana Gold as class representative,
 - b. A West Virginia class and appointing Tammy Emery as class representative,
 - c. An Illinois class and appointing Mary Louise Ference as class representative,
 - d. An Minnesota class and appointing Laura Norris as class representative,
 - e. A Pennsylvania class and appointing Donald Fursman as class representative, and
 - f. A Florida class and appointing John Triana as class representative;
2. Appointment of the undersigned as counsel for the proposed Class(es);
3. A declaration that Defendant's actions complained of herein violate the state consumer protection statutes;
4. A declaration that Defendant is financially responsible for notifying all Class Members;
5. Injunctive relief requiring Defendant to replace and/or repair all Products installed in structures owned by the Class;
6. A declaration that Defendant must disgorge, for the benefit of the Class, all or part of its ill-gotten profits received from the sale of defective Product, and/or to make full restitution to Plaintiffs and the Class Members;
7. An award of costs and attorneys' fees, as allowed by law, and/or from a common fund created hereby;
8. Leave to amend to conform to the evidence presented at trial; and

9. Orders granting such other and further relief as may be appropriate.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiffs hereby demand a jury trial for all individual and Class claims so triable.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED AND DATED this 2nd day of February, 2018.

ROBINS KAPLAN LLC

By: /s/ Michael F. Ram, SBN #104805
Michael F. Ram, SBN #104805
Email: mram@robinskaplan.com
Susan Brown, SBN #287986
Email: sbrown@robinskaplan.com
ROBINS KAPLAN LLC
2440 West El Camino Real, Suite 100
Mountain View, CA 94040
Telephone: (650) 784-4040
Facsimile: (650) 784-4041

Jeffrey B. Cereghino, SBN #099480
Email: jbc@rocklawcal.com
Matt Malone, SBN #221545
Email: mjm@rocklawcal.com
ROCK LAW LLP
101 Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 433-4949
Facsimile: (415) 433-7311

Charles J. LaDuca, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
Email: charles@cuneolaw.com
Brendan Thompson, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
Email: brendant@cuneolaw.com
CUNEO GILBERT & LaDUCA, LLP
4725 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 200016
Telephone: (202) 789-3960
Facsimile: (202) 789-1813

Class Counsel

Beth E. Terrell, SBN #178181
 Email: bterrell@terrellmarshall.com
 TERRELL MARSHALL LAW GROUP
 PLLC
 936 North 34th Street, Suite 300
 Seattle, Washington 98103-8869
 Telephone: (206) 816-6603
 Facsimile: (206) 319-5450

Jordan L. Chaikin, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
 Email: jordan@chaikinlawfirm.com
 CHAIKIN LAW FIRM PLLC
 1280 University Drive, Suite 600
 Fort Myers, Florida 33907
 Telephone: (239) 470-8338
 Facsimile: (239) 433-6836

Michael McShane, SBN #127944
 Email: mmcshane@audetlaw.com
 AUDET & PARTNERS, LLP
 711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500
 San Francisco, California 94102
 Telephone: (415) 568-2555
 Facsimile: (415) 568-2556

Robert K. Shelquist, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
 Email: rkshelquist@locklaw.com
 LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN
 100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 2200
 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401
 Telephone: (612) 339-6900
 Facsimile: (612) 339-0981

Erica C. Mirabella
 Email: erica@mirabellallc.com
 132 Boylston Street, 5th Floor
 Boston, Massachusetts 02116
 Telephone: (617) 580-8270

Charles E. Schaffer, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
 Email: cschaffer@lfsblaw.com
 LEVIN, FISHBEIN, SEDRAN & BERMAN
 510 Walnut Street, Suite 500
 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
 Telephone: (215) 592-1500
 Facsimile: (215) 592-4663

Daniel C. Calvert, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
Email: dcalvert@yourlawyer.com
PARKER WAICHMAN LLP
27300 Riverview Center Blvd., Suite 103
Bonita Springs, Florida 34134
Telephone: (239) 390-1000
Facsimile: (239) 390-0055

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Certified Classes

LOCAL RULE 5-1(I)(3) STATEMENT

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that in concurrence to the filing of this document permission was obtained from the signatory, and that I will maintain records to support this concurrence by the signatory subject to this document as required under the local rules.

DATED this 2nd day of February, 2018.

ROBINS KAPLAN LLC

By: /s/ Michael F. Ram, SBN #104805

Michael F. Ram, SBN #104805

Email: mram@robinskaplan.com

Susan Brown, SBN #287986

Email: sbrown@robinskaplan.com

ROBINS KAPLAN LLC

2440 West El Camino Real, Suite 100

Mountain View, CA 94040

Telephone: (650) 784-4040

Facsimile: (650) 784-4041

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Certified Classes

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Michael Ram, hereby certify that on February 2, 2018, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Diane Flannery, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
 Email: dflannery@mcguirewoods.com
 Bethany Gayle Lukitsch, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
 Email: blukitsch@mcguirewoods.com
 McGUIREWOODS LLP
 800 East Canal Street
 Richmond, Virginia 23219-3916
 Telephone: (804) 775-1000
 Facsimile: (804) 775-1061

David Reidy
 Email: dreidy@mcguirewoods.com
 MCGUIREWOODS LLP
 Two Embarcadero Center, Suite 1300
 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: (415) 844-1969
 Facsimile: (415) 844-1913

Attorneys for Defendant Lumber Liquidators, Inc.

DATED this 2nd day of February, 2018.

ROBINS KAPLAN LLC

By: /s/ Michael F. Ram, SBN #104805
 Michael F. Ram, SBN #104805
 Email: mram@robinskaplan.com
 Susan Brown, SBN #287986
 Email: sbrown@robinskaplan.com
 ROBINS KAPLAN LLC
 2440 West El Camino Real, Suite 100
 Mountain View, CA 94040
 Telephone: (650) 784-4040
 Facsimile: (650) 784-4041

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Certified Classes